

Table of Contents

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| § 1.01 | Introduction | 1 |
| § 1.02 | Assessing Climate Change Under NEPA | 2 |
| [1] | NEPA and Environmental Review | 2 |
| [2] | Evaluating Climate Change Under NEPA | 6 |
| [a] | Litigation | 6 |
| [i] | Judicial Review of Agency Action | 6 |
| [ii] | Cases Rejecting Adequacy of NEPA Review | 7 |
| [iii] | Cases Upholding Adequacy of NEPA Review | 10 |
| [iv] | Settlements | 13 |
| [b] | Draft CEQ Guidance on Evaluating Climate Change Impacts Under NEPA | 16 |
| § 1.03 | Assessing Climate Change Under State “Little NEPAs” | 22 |
| [1] | California | 22 |
| [a] | Background | 22 |
| [b] | Litigation | 23 |
| [i] | Climate Change Analysis Not Required | 23 |
| [ii] | Climate Change Analyses Required | 25 |
| [iii] | Litigation by California Attorney General | 27 |
| [c] | CEQA Regulations Regarding Climate Change | 28 |
| [i] | Background | 28 |
| [ii] | Cumulative Impacts | 29 |
| [iii] | Significance Thresholds | 29 |
| [iv] | Mitigation | 30 |
| [v] | Tiering | 31 |
| [d] | Guidance for Project Proponents | 31 |
| [i] | Interim Significance Thresholds | 31 |
| [ii] | Other Guidance | 33 |
| [2] | Massachusetts | 33 |
| [a] | Background | 33 |
| [b] | Environmental Review Under MEPA | 34 |
| [c] | The 2007 MEPA Policy | 34 |
| [d] | The 2009 Revised MEPA Policy | 35 |
| [e] | The 2010 Further Revised MEPA Policy | 37 |
| [3] | Minnesota | 38 |
| [4] | Michigan | 40 |
| [5] | Washington | 40 |
| [a] | Background | 40 |
| [b] | King County, Washington | 41 |
| [c] | City of Seattle | 44 |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| [d] | SEPA Implementation Working Group | 45 |
| [e] | Draft Greenhouse Gas Guidance | 46 |
| § 1.04 | Conclusion | 47 |
| Appendix A | Quantification Methodologies, Tools, and Emission Factors | App. A-1 |